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Abstract: The analysis of circulating tumour nucleic acids (ctNAs) provides a minimally invasive way to assess the mutational spectrum of a tumour. However, effective and practical methods for analyzing this emerging class of markers are lacking. Analysis of ctNAs using a sensor-based approach has notable challenges, as it is vital to differentiate nucleic acids from normal cells from mutation-bearing sequences emerging from tumours. Moreover, many genes related to cancer have dozens of different mutations. Herein, we report an electrochemical approach that directly detects genes with mutations in patient serum by using combinatorial probes (CPs). The CPs enable detection of all of the mutant alleles derived from the same part of the gene. As a proof of concept, we analyze mutations of the EGFR gene, which has more than 40 clinically relevant alterations that include deletions, insertions, and point mutations. Our CP-based approach accurately detects mutant sequences directly in patient serum.

Noninvasive analysis of circulating tumour-derived nucleic acids (ctNAs) is an appealing approach for cancer monitoring, as serial blood draws are possible for repetitive and longitudinal sampling, while solid tumours require invasive biopsies.[1] However, the reliable detection of nucleic acids containing mutations is very challenging as patient samples contain a very small percentage of mutated nucleic acids in a large background of normal nucleic acids.

Analysis of mutated nucleic acids in the blood, for example the EGFR (epidermal growth factor receptor) and KRAS (kirsten rat sarcoma viral oncogene homologue) genes, could allow specific monitoring of cancer-related sequences.[2] However, for detection of these mutated ctNAs, a very sensitive and specific method is required, as mutated ctNAs are present along with a high level of normal sequences. Currently, the most commonly used methods for ctNA analysis are DNA sequencing[3] and the polymerase chain reaction (PCR).[4] DNA sequencing is a powerful technique for research, but its application is restricted because of the high cost for routine clinical use and long turnaround time (2–3 weeks).[5] Although conventional PCR methods cannot detect mutated ctNAs as they cannot detect minor variants at levels below 20%, some PCR-based methods, such as allele-specific clamp PCR, COLD-PCR (co-amplification at lower denaturation temperature-PCR), and digital PCR have successfully detected ctNAs.[6] However, PCR methods are susceptible to false negatives and positives produced by interference from chemical species present in clinical samples; the use of this approach therefore requires trained personnel and preprocessing of samples including purification of nucleic acids. This requirement limits the use of this technique to clinical laboratories. Thus, a PCR-free method that is able to detect mutated ctNAs directly in serum or blood is urgently needed to allow liquid biopsies for monitoring ctNAs to become more routine.

Chip-based electronic and electrochemical methods have been pursued as a promising alternative for clinical sample analysis because they can be automated and do not rely on costly instrumentation.[5] Particularly, electrochemical methods have received attention because of their low cost, high sensitivity, and amenability to high levels of multiplexing.[6] Electrochemical techniques have been employed successfully to analyze various tumour markers[7] and infectious pathogens,[8] but the analysis of ctNAs for tumour-related mutations in patient samples is a new application for this type of analysis that was first described less than three years ago.[9]

An electrochemical strategy developed by our laboratory for the analysis of a small set of point mutations in ctNAs was one of the first to address how a chip-based approach could facilitate ctNA analysis.[9] High-surface-area, three-dimensional microelectrodes were functionalized with probe sequences complementary to a sequence of interest, and hybridization of targets was read out with an electrocatalytic reporter strategy. PNA clamp molecules were used to limit cross-reactivity with wild-type nucleic acids and other mutated sequences. The technique specifically detected mutated ctNAs at physiologically relevant levels in 30–40 min. However, the KRAS and BRAF genes only contain point mutations in ctNAs. There many other sequence alterations that may appear in ctNAs. For example, EGFR, a sequence that is often mutated in lung cancer tumours, contains not only point mutations but also deletions and insertions.[10] However, analysis of EGFR is very challenging as it has more than 40 clinically relevant sequence changes.[11]

Herein, we report an electrochemical approach that enables the direct analysis of genes that have large panels of sequence alterations in ctNAs from patient serum (Figure 1). We designed combinatorial probes (CPs) that are able to screen all of the possible mutations present in the same region of the gene. For example, designing one CP enables the
EGFR genes are associated with a number of cancers, including lung cancer, anal cancers, and glioblastoma multiforme; and the potency of targeted therapies are affected by mutations in this gene.\[9\] We design combinatorial PNA probes with variable positions in which X represents equimolar concentration of A, C, G, and T, at the N-terminal of the PNA probe (Figure 1A). The combinatorial positions with the probes produce more favorable ΔG values for the complexes between CPs and mutated sequences than for the wild-type sequences and enables the CPs to bind mutant sequences specifically (see Supporting Information, Table 1). Moreover, to improve specificity further, PNA clamps are used to block the wild-type sequences in solution.

Photolithography was used to produce an array of forty sensors for multiplexed ctNA analysis (Figure 1C; see Supporting Information for all experimental details).\[11\] Gold contact pads and electrical leads were selectively patterned on the glass slides, which were pre-coated with chromium, gold, and a layer of positive photosensitive. On top of this gold pattern, a layer of SU-8 was deposited and selectively developed to form an insulating top layer with 15 μm openings at the tips of the leads. Three-dimensional gold microsensors were then generated by electrodeposition of gold that produces anisotropic microneedles. Since nanostructuring enhances the sensitivity of the assay,\[12\] we electrodeposited the Au structures with a fine layer of Pd to produce nanostructured microelectrodes (NMEs). An SEM image of an NME is shown in Figure 1D. These NMEs have been previously demonstrated to be effective in the specific detection of nucleic acids at subfemtomolar levels, even in the presence of complex biological fluids.\[7\–d.4a–c.9\]

We immobilized CPs specific to the mutant target of interest onto the sensors through a thiol linker (Figure 1B). After target binding and washing, we used an electrocatalytic reporter system comprised of [Ru(NH₃)₆]³⁺ and [Fe(CN)₆]⁴⁻ to readout the presence of specific mutated nucleic acid sequences.\[13\] [Ru(NH₃)₆]³⁺ is electrostatically attracted to the negatively charged phosphate backbone of nucleic acids that bind to the probes attached onto the surface of sensors and is reduced to [Ru(NH₃)₆]²⁺ to generate an electrochemical signal when the electrode is biased at the reduction potential. This signal is highly amplified by adding [Fe(CN)₆]⁴⁻, a more easily reduced anionic electron acceptor, which chemically oxidizes [Ru(NH₃)₆]²⁺ back to [Ru(NH₃)₆]³⁺ allowing for multiple turnovers of [Ru(NH₃)₆]³⁺. This reporter system enables ultrasensitive detection of NA without the need of enzymatic amplification. The change in current after target hybridization is used to determine target binding (typical
differential pulse voltammograms (DPVs) before and after application of the mutant positive patient serum are shown in Figure 1B).

To validate the approach, we first investigated whether CPs could identify different deletion mutations at exon 19. We individually challenged CP-functionalized NME sensors with different synthetic deletion mutant targets. For instance, we challenged CP-modified sensors with 4 deletion mutant targets individually (2235–2239 del15, 2235–2252 > AAT, 2236–2253 del18, and 2236–2250 del15). We also compared the current change when the same sensors were challenged with wild-type targets (E19DelWT). We observed that there was a clear positive current change for mutant targets (sensor 2 of Figure 2). After observing that the CP could detect deletion mutations, we investigated whether CP could also detect other mutations, such as insertion mutations at exon 20 (sensor 5) and point mutations at exon 18 (sensor 1).

Sensor 5 was challenged with 3 insertion mutant targets (2319–2320 ins1, 2315–2316 ins2, and 2315–2316 ins3) and wild-type target (E20InsWT). Sensor 1 was challenged with 3 different point mutant targets at exon 18 (2155G > A, 2155G > T, 2156G > C) and wild-type target (2155-6 G). In addition, we tested the same sensor (sensor 1) with a solution containing a mixture of 3 point mutant targets (2155G > A, 2155G > T, and 2156G > C). For all of the cases, we observed a clear signal rise in the presence of at least one of the mutant targets. Moreover, as expected, the current change measured by sensor 1 for a mixed target solution was higher than that for individual targets. These results clearly suggest that CP can identify its targets successfully. We further validated other regular 4 PNA probes designed for other point mutations at different regions of EGFR (sensor 3, sensor 4, sensor 6, and sensor 7 of Figure 2).

To investigate the specificity of the approach, we challenged the sensor for insertion mutations (sensor 5) and the sensor for wild-type EGFR (sensor 8) with wild-type EGFR RNA isolated from A549 cell lines (Figure 3A). We observed a signal increase for both of the sensors in absence of the clamps for the wild-type gene, highlighting the need for the clamp sequences to limit binding of the wild-type sequence. Next, to investigate the specificity of our sensor for EGFR genes versus other genes present in the human sample, we challenged sensor 5 (sensor for insertion mutations) and sensor 8 (sensor for wild-type) with samples of ctNA isolated from serum collected from a healthy donor with and without fragments of exon 20 of EGFR (exon 20 EGFR fragments were extracted from the latter sample using biotinylated oligonucleotides and streptavidin beads) (Figure 3B). No signal change was observed, for sensor 5 with exon E20 EGFR-depleted ctNAs, indicating that only EGFR can produce a significant signal on the sensors.

The final goal of our effort to develop a multiplexed mutation-discriminating chip is to enable the direct analysis of mutated sequences in patient samples. We elected to use samples from non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) patients for this validation study. As lung cancer samples could also contain KRAS mutations, a combinatorial probe was

Figure 2. A) Multiplexed sensor strategy. Seven different types of sensors were generated by immobilizing sets of CPs or single probes (SPs) targeting different types of EGFR mutations on sensors arrayed on a multiplexed chip. B) Testing of sensors with synthetic targets. The y-axis indicates electrochemical current values obtained with different target/probe combinations. Sensor 1, exon 18 target sequences: a) 2155G > A mutant, b) 2155G > T mutant, c) 2156G > C mutant, d) mixed target solution containing (a-c), and e) wild-type; Sensor 2, exon 19 target sequences: f) 2235–2239 del15, g) 2235–2252 > AAT, h) 2236–2253 del18, i) 2236–2250 del15, and j) wild-type; Sensor 3, exon 20 target sequences: k) point mutant 2369C > T, and l) wild-type; Sensor 4, exon 20 target sequences: m) point mutant 2303G > T, and n) wild-type; Sensor 5, exon 20 target sequences: o) 2319–2320 ins1, p) 2315–2316 ins2, q) 2315–2316 ins3, and r) wild-type; Sensor 6, exon 21 targets: s) mutant 2573T > G and t) wild-type; Sensor 7, exon 21 targets: u) point mutant 2582A and v) wild-type. Concentration of target solution was 1 nM. All of the target solutions were mixed with 10 nM of clamps for wild-type.

Figure 3. Sensors were modified with combinatorial probes for insertion mutations at exon 20 (Sensor 5) and wild-type probes (Sensor WT). A) The modified sensors were challenged with wild-type EGFR RNA (100 pg μL⁻¹) isolated from A549 cell lines in the presence (b) and absence (c) of PNA clamps for wild-type. Combinatorial probes hybridize with wild-type EGFR RNA in absence of clamp. B) The modified sensors were challenged with ctNAs isolated from a healthy donor serum containing exon 20 fragments of EGFR before (c) and after (b) depletion with biotinylated oligonucleotides and streptavidin beads.
designed for mutated sequences and a conventional probe was generated for the wild-type sequence. These probes were immobilized on a multiplexed chip along with 8 probes for EGFR analysis. A wild-type EGFR sensor (sensor 8) was used as a positive control and wild-type sensor for KRAS was used as negative control. We used our multiplexed chip to analyze ctNAs in serum samples from NSCLC patients (Table 1 and Supporting Information, Figure 1).

Six of the eight NSCLC patient samples were positive for EGFR mutations and four of the seven samples were positive for KRAS mutations. A threshold value for the CP assay was determined from the mean signal collected from a healthy donor serum plus three standard deviations. If the signal level collected with a patient serum was higher than the threshold value, the sample was considered to be mutant positive, and if it was lower, mutant negative. We also used a previously validated PCR method to confirm the presence or absence of the EGFR mutations in ctNAs isolated from the same patient samples, and the results agreed with our approach (Tables 1 and 2).[110]

It is noteworthy that in case of sample 3, the PCR assay identified only the E20 insertion mutation, whereas our CP assay also detected the E20 insertion mutation. In addition, our approach also identified a point mutation at exon 18 for the same sample. In the case of sample 6, although the PCR assay detected no mutation, our assay was successful in detecting a mutation in this sample. The CP assay thus successfully detects ctNA EGFR and KRAS mutations directly in the serum of NSCLC patients. We note that clamp PCR was not able to detect mutations directly in patient serum.[161] Direct analysis of patient samples without purification, is a significant advantage as it eliminates any issues related to bias in the pool of sequences that are isolated.

In conclusion, we have analyzed ctNAs for a broad range of sequence alterations using a highly specific and sensitive electrochemical assay applicable to the analysis of serum samples of NSCLC patients. The approach can detect not only known mutations but also any unknown mutations in the same region of the genes. This assay could also detect other genes in ctNAs with many somatic mutations or other sequences with significant mutational variation; for example, genotyping of drug resistant Mycobacterium tuberculosis. The use of a multiplexed chip in this strategy allows controls and self-calibration to be performed in parallel with the mutational analysis, increasing the reliability of the analysis. Minimally invasive, serum-based analysis of ctNA provides an alternative to tumour tissue biopsies and offers a new way for monitoring drug response and treatment efficacy. This approach allows for straightforward assay workflow, minimizes sample loss, and enables the analysis of small samples. The significantly reduced analysis time, which can be as short as thirty minutes, makes this approach more attractive compared to PCR or sequencing methods.
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Table 2: EGFR clamp PCR with total ctNAs isolated from lung cancer patient samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>ΔCt-1</th>
<th>ΔCt-2</th>
<th>T790M</th>
<th>S768I</th>
<th>E20 Ins</th>
<th>L858R</th>
<th>L861Q</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C719X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E19 Del</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>−1</td>
<td>−1</td>
<td>−1</td>
<td>−1</td>
<td>−4</td>
<td>−13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>−1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>−1</td>
<td>−5</td>
<td>−3</td>
<td>−3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>−2</td>
<td>−2.5</td>
<td>−2.5</td>
<td>−2</td>
<td>−3</td>
<td>−5</td>
<td>−4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>−2</td>
<td>−2</td>
<td>−2</td>
<td>−4</td>
<td>−2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>−10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−5</td>
<td>−5</td>
<td>−5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>−12.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>−</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] For the clamp PCR, ΔCt-1 ≥ 2 was considered to be mutated and ΔCt-1 < 0 was considered to be non-mutated. If 0 < ΔCt-1 < 2, another parameter, ΔCt-2, needed to be considered and ΔCt-2 > 3 is considered to be wild-type. [b] The cycle number in which a detectable signal is measured is referred to as the cycle threshold (CT). ΔCt-1 values are calculated using the expression: ΔCt-1 = (Standard Ct) − (Sample Ct) and ΔCt-2 values are derived by analyzing Ct values of the non-PNA mix versus the Ct values of the samples, for example, ΔCt-2 = (Sample Ct) − (non-PNA mix Ct). The standard Ct is 35 for the 7500 AB thermocycler used for this experiment.
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